

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------|
| 09/778,553 | 02/07/2001 | Donald R. Gentner | 0007056-0056/P5242/RSB | 9451 |

24209 7590 08/12/2004

GUNNISON MCKAY & HODGSON, LLP
1900 GARDEN ROAD
SUITE 220
MONTEREY, CA 93940

EXAMINER

SMITH, PETER J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 09/778,553 | Applicant(s) GENTNER ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Peter J Smith | Art Unit 2176 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 February 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 February 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2176

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: application filed on 2/7/2001.
2. Claims 1-42 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 15, and 29 are independent claims.

Drawings

3. Figures 1-5 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawing sheets are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. **Claims 1-3, 15-17, and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Krause et al., US 5,757,372 patented 5/26/1998.**

Regarding independent claims 1, 15, and 29, Krause discloses identifying a plurality of events, storing a plurality of states associated with the document upon the occurrence of the

Art Unit: 2176

plurality of events, and obtaining the desired state using the plurality of states in col. 1 lines 42-59 and col. 2 lines 6-10.

Regarding dependent claims 2, 16, and 30, Krause discloses transitioning from a previous state to a current state in the plurality of states in col. 1 lines 42-59 and col. 2 lines 6-10.

Regarding dependent claims 3, 17, and 31, Krause discloses transitioning from a current state to a previous state in the plurality of states in col. 1 lines 42-59 and col. 2 lines 6-10.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 4-14, 18-28, and 32-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krause et al., US 5,757,372 patented 5/26/1998.**

Regarding dependent claims 4, 18, and 32, Krause teaches wherein a user may save multiple versions, or states, of a document being worked on and easily and selectively transition from the current state to a previous state or from the previous state to a current state in col. 1 lines 42-59 and col. 2 lines 6-10. Krause teaches in col. 1 lines 31-36 that in the prior art it is well known that multiple versions of a document may be saved automatically when a qualifying event occurs such as the passing of a preset time interval or the initiation of a prescribed user action.

Art Unit: 2176

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Krause to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the prior art knowledge presented in Krause to have modified Krause to have automatically saved a version of the document of Krause when the document is closed. It would have been obvious and desirable to have done this so that the user could have returned to the state of the document immediately prior to closing the document at a later time when they wish to reopen the document.

Regarding dependent claims 5, 19, and 33, Krause teaches wherein a user may save multiple versions, or states, of a document being worked on and easily and selectively transition from the current state to a previous state or from the previous state to a current state in col. 1 lines 42-59 and col. 2 lines 6-10. Krause teaches in col. 1 lines 31-36 that in the prior art it is well known that multiple versions of a document may be saved automatically when a qualifying event occurs such as the passing of a preset time interval or the initiation of a prescribed user action.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Krause to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the prior art knowledge presented in Krause to have modified Krause to have automatically saved a version of the document of Krause when the document is copied. It would have been obvious and desirable to have done this so that the user could have returned to the state of the document immediately prior to copying the document in the event file is damaged during the copying process.

Regarding dependent claims 6, 20, and 34, Krause teaches wherein a user may save multiple versions, or states, of a document being worked on and easily and selectively transition from the current state to a previous state or from the previous state to a current state in col. 1 lines 42-59 and col. 2 lines 6-10. Krause teaches in col. 1 lines 31-36 that in the prior art it is well known that multiple versions of a document may be saved automatically when a qualifying event occurs such as the passing of a preset time interval or the initiation of a prescribed user action.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Krause to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the prior art knowledge presented in Krause to have modified Krause to have automatically saved a version of the document of Krause when the document is synchronized with a device. It would have been obvious and desirable to have done this so that the user could have returned to the state of the document immediately prior to synchronizing the document with a device in the event file is damaged during the synchronizing process.

Regarding dependent claims 7, 21, and 35, Krause teaches wherein a user may save multiple versions, or states, of a document being worked on and easily and selectively transition from the current state to a previous state or from the previous state to a current state in col. 1 lines 42-59 and col. 2 lines 6-10. Krause teaches in col. 1 lines 31-36 that in the prior art it is well known that multiple versions of a document may be saved automatically when a qualifying event occurs such as the passing of a preset time interval or the initiation of a prescribed user action.

Art Unit: 2176

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Krause to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the prior art knowledge presented in Krause to have modified Krause to have automatically saved a version of the document of Krause when a different user edits the document. It would have been obvious and desirable to have done this so that the first user could have returned to the state of the document immediately prior to the editing of the document by the second user in case the second user makes changes to the document that are undesirable to the first user.

Regarding dependent claims 8, 22, and 36, Krause teaches wherein a user may save multiple versions, or states, of a document being worked on and easily and selectively transition from the current state to a previous state or from the previous state to a current state in col. 1 lines 42-59 and col. 2 lines 6-10. Krause teaches in col. 1 lines 31-36 that in the prior art it is well known that multiple versions of a document may be saved automatically when a qualifying event occurs such as the passing of a preset time interval or the initiation of a prescribed user action.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Krause to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the prior art knowledge presented in Krause to have modified Krause to have automatically saved a version of the document of Krause when the document was transmitted using a file transfer mechanism. It would have been obvious and desirable to have done this so that the user could have returned to a version prior to the transfer of the document in case the file was undesirably modified during or after the file transfer process.

Art Unit: 2176

Regarding dependent claim 9, 23, and 37, Krause teaches wherein a user may save multiple versions, or states, of a document being worked on and easily and selectively transition from the current state to a previous state or from the previous state to a current state in col. 1 lines 42-59 and col. 2 lines 6-10. Krause teaches in col. 1 lines 31-36 that in the prior art it is well known that multiple versions of a document may be saved automatically when a qualifying event occurs such as the passing of a preset time interval or the initiation of a prescribed user action.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Krause to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the prior art knowledge presented in Krause to have modified Krause to have automatically saved a version of the document of Krause when the document was transmitted in an email message. It would have been obvious and desirable to have done this so that the user could have returned to a version prior to the transfer of the document in the email message in case the file was undesirably modified during or after the email process.

Regarding dependent claim 10, 24, and 38, Krause teaches wherein a user may save multiple versions, or states, of a document being worked on and easily and selectively transition from the current state to a previous state or from the previous state to a current state in col. 1 lines 42-59 and col. 2 lines 6-10. Krause teaches in col. 1 lines 31-36 that in the prior art it is well known that multiple versions of a document may be saved automatically when a qualifying event occurs such as the passing of a preset time interval or the initiation of a prescribed user action.

Art Unit: 2176

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Krause to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the prior art knowledge presented in Krause to have modified Krause to have automatically saved a version of the document of Krause when the document was transmitted via a chat program. It would have been obvious and desirable to have done this so that the user could have returned to a version prior to the transfer of the document via the chat program in case the file was undesirably modified during or after the email process.

Regarding dependent claim 11, 25, and 39, Krause teaches wherein a user may save multiple versions, or states, of a document being worked on and easily and selectively transition from the current state to a previous state or from the previous state to a current state in col. 1 lines 42-59 and col. 2 lines 6-10. Krause teaches in col. 1 lines 31-36 that in the prior art it is well known that multiple versions of a document may be saved automatically when a qualifying event occurs such as the passing of a preset time interval or the initiation of a prescribed user action.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Krause to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the prior art knowledge presented in Krause to have modified Krause to have automatically saved a version of the document of Krause during a user defined event. The customization of the event would have allowed the user to have automatically saved a version of the document so that the user would have been able to have returned to the version prior to the event in case the file was undesirably modified during or after the user defined event.

Art Unit: 2176

Regarding dependent claim 12, 26, and 40, Krause teaches wherein a user may save multiple versions, or states, of a document being worked on and easily and selectively transition from the current state to a previous state or from the previous state to a current state in col. 1 lines 42-59 and col. 2 lines 6-10. Krause teaches in col. 1 lines 31-36 that in the prior art it is well known that multiple versions of a document may be saved automatically when a qualifying event occurs such as the passing of a preset time interval or the initiation of a prescribed user action.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Krause to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the prior art knowledge presented in Krause to have modified Krause to have automatically saved a version of the document of Krause when the document was not modified during a given time period. This would have allowed the user to have returned to a prior version in case the document was undesirably modified after the given time period.

Regarding dependent claim 13, 27, and 41, Krause teaches wherein a user may save multiple versions, or states, of a document being worked on and easily and selectively transition from the current state to a previous state or from the previous state to a current state in col. 1 lines 42-59 and col. 2 lines 6-10. Krause teaches in col. 1 lines 31-36 that in the prior art it is well known that multiple versions of a document may be saved automatically when a qualifying event occurs such as the passing of a preset time interval or the initiation of a prescribed user action.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Krause to have created the claimed invention. It would have been

Art Unit: 2176

obvious and desirable to have used the prior art knowledge presented in Krause to have modified Krause to have automatically saved a version of the document of Krause when the document was modified. This would have allowed the user to have returned to a prior version before the modification to the document was made in case the modification turns out to be undesirable for the user.

Regarding dependent claim 14, 28, and 42, Krause teaches wherein a user may save multiple versions, or states, of a document being worked on and easily and selectively transition from the current state to a previous state or from the previous state to a current state in col. 1 lines 42-59 and col. 2 lines 6-10. Krause teaches in col. 1 lines 31-36 that in the prior art it is well known that multiple versions of a document may be saved automatically when a qualifying event occurs such as the passing of a preset time interval or the initiation of a prescribed user action.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Krause to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the prior art knowledge presented in Krause to have modified Krause to have automatically saved a version of the document of Krause when the document was printed. This would have allowed the user to have returned to a prior version in case the document was undesirably modified during the printing of the document.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Ball et al., US 6,596,030 B2 continuation filed 10/27/1995 discloses identifying

Art Unit: 2176

changes in on-line data repositories. The documents in the remote repository change in content from version-to-version. Aoyama et al., US 6,301,592 B1 filed 11/4/1998 discloses displaying version information for a document. Imachi et al., US 6,272,678 B1 filed 11/4/1998 discloses a document auto-changing mode wherein the version number is updated each time a new version is prepared. Hug et al., US 5,806,078 patented 9/8/1998 discloses a version management system for storing and retrieving changes to documents. Ball et al., US 6,366,933 B1 filed 10/27/1995 discloses identifying changes in on-line data repositories. The documents in the remote repository change in content from version-to-version. Ishida, US 5,535,332 patented 7/9/1996 discloses shared-data alteration status management. Everingham, US 6,327,611 B1 filed 11/4/1998 discloses electronic document routing employing automatic versioning. Selesky et al., US 5,890,181 patented 3/30/1999 discloses remotely grouping contents of an action history stack. Korenshtein, US 6,523,134 B2 9/18/1998 discloses a selective undo function allowing a user to select any single specific action that was previously recorded by the computer and undo only that selected action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter J Smith whose telephone number is 703-305-5931. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays 7:00am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 703-305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PJS

August 2, 2004

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM L. BASHORE
PATENT EXAMINER
TECH CENTER 2100